Dear Paul, 5/27/77

Thanks for the promptness of your 5/23 response to my 5/19 on Alvarez. It is in today's mail and of this mail I address it first.

Perfection, including of recollection, certainly is not a human state. Less can I now pretend a solid recollection of what you said in response to my questions of the past on this.

However, it interests me enough to take time from work for which I do not have time in part because we are in court with ERDA a lying defendant.

If I am not clear please ask me to explain. I'm not having a clear day. I had to drive Lil to Washington, something I never do under other circumstances than her need, and while it was not as much too much as it has been it was a bit much. Day before yesterday I felt badly enough to go to the doctor instead of court but Jim seems to have done better without me.

Howard has gone through many of my files of the periods involved. He may recall what I may not.

If there was no meaningful ERDA support for what Alvarez did why should he state he used any ERDA support in this?

With or without his Nobel, would you dispute that stating the work was done with ERDA support tends to give it a more important tone, a suggestion of official recognition?

I can project your suggestions that ERDA support was little. But if I do I must ask even more questions about Alvarez in all of this and most of all in his represention of any ERDA connection.

Can you understand my difficult with one of your paragrpahs that has two separate parts: "I expect that it is quite misleading in this particular case" is the end. It begins "The lab's preprint version of Alvarez' paper bore a <u>preprinted</u> statement on the cover that the work was sponsored by the U.S. government; the cover said it was prepared for ERDA 'under Contract W-7405-ENG-48.' I'm pretty sure that this is a general contract..."

Saying it was prepared for ERDA is even stronger than saying it was prepared ~~for~~ with ERDA's support and farthurs the question I have that you disagree with, even if you put money out of your own pocket.

You would be surprised if "ERDA gave him any money earmarked for this." Would you also be surprised if they authoried his use of other money for this?

Would you also be surprised to know that there was a vicious campaign against Aebersold once he suggested the use of NAAs and more over his emphasis? And that thereafter first he was frozen out entirely and second committed suicide? The reason given for not doing what he urged is ridiculous, as Jim will confirm.

My Alvarez file has disappeared so I can't check it. I have a strong recollection that he is dictatorial and authoritarian and writing him led to only these kinds of displays, no real responses. I've been sent copies of his correspondence with others. He is the one and only oracle, straight from Olympus.

I have forgotten the story of what he got interested over. This part may be in storage as my files have expanded. It goes back to 1966-7. As I recall it some of his students got talking about this after Whitewash appeared in California, circa 7/4/66 except in some cases earlier by mail. I recall clearly that later you said he had nothing to do with your thesis and I neither believe nor suggest you would not be truthful about this. What I do not recall is whether or not you were one of the earlier students and whether you told me who the others were or who did. If anyone did. My recollection is not clear but I do know I have some kind of file in storage. If you can fill me in on this it might have some value to Jim as the suit goes along.

You are a physicist. Among physicists he is something special. He may also be in terms of your relations with him, if they are all of the past.

I look at these things in a different way. I do not doubt Eerner vonBraun's skill in rocketry. But I also do not lose sight of the fact that this personable man killed thousands of innocents in Britain with a machine designed for use against civilians polulations - and used that way. Need I tick off those eminences of science who served the paranoid Stalin? Or tell you that the respected daughted of a prestigeous U.S. Ambassador fucked every prominent Nazi she could lure into a semblance of privacy?

So in my interest whether Alvarez is an eminence of science or a delight to those who know him is irrelevant, as it may not be to you. Reread what you have written me. You make excuses, weak excuses I think. I have no objection to that. But I do want to put as much of this as I can together for a number of reasons, ranging from his allegation of official support and after the time of the official investigation to what to me is the abandonment of science and the deliberateness of dishonesty in this piece.

Project Jason of Code-Name Jason may be irrelevant. I'd like to know more about it and his role in it if you can tell me. I have a very limited file no longer in my office. I think I informed you when I first learned.

I am a little put out about this because I am certain much earlier publication was intended and was put off when I asked the publication for the same space and facilities. After that no publication for all those years. I regret that knowing it was coming, if only from the preprint (of which I'd much appreciate a copy, which can be sent to Jim instead if you prefer), you did not let me know.

I would also like to consult you as a physicist. Taking an object like a melon and firing at it with whatever ammo of .30-06 caliber you used - remember this in in the sense of Alvarez' use, not your and Olson's shooting or writing - would you expect from knowledge of the laws of physics that you would obtain the same reaction regardless of where the bullet hit? As at the tip top of the melon, the very bottom, the point on which it rested or close to that, or the approximate middle?

Would you expect the same reactions with and without the substitution of something for bone?

I have no present recollection of your earlier responses, but I am fairly confident I then had questions about there being nothing like a neck and spinal column, nothing like naural and muscular reactions. I recall no addressing of these and what I believe those pure in science might regard as scientific considerations in the Jason/ERDA/Alvarez piece.

I do assume that you do not subscribe to all he has written. I do not assume that you disagree with all. I do believe this adventure, the word you do not like, begins with the melonry and I do not believe, as I'm sure I've said, that the melonry was authentic or even scientific, as one who lacks a PhD can opine on what is and is not science.

Your letter does not address your relationshop or lack of it with all of this. I have no interest in pressing you on this. I do not care, really. I merely note that whether or not you and he "fully agreed" is not what I think you should be addressing, though if you do not want to I will not ask you.

I'm a little older than I was, a lot more tired than I was and a lot less angry and disappointed that when I first saw the first of this mishmash of pseudoscience. I did respond in haste and with mixed passion and disappointment. I recall no factual refutation of anything I dashed off, no need to apologize save perhaps for roughness in expression. If there is any apology owing I'd like to know the factual basis. But I have no interest in further dispute and I expect no defense of what His Eminense has done from you. My interests as now restricted to what I've said.

Thanks for what you said about the Gordon show. It was not easy to hold back, less so after multitudinous double-crossings on visuals and other things, like the overt breach of confidence following the break for a commercial.

I would like, for or to Jim, a copy of the preprint with all the official gobbledegook visible. Thanks and best wishes,